

**WORDS HAVE CONSEQUENCES: THE IMPACT OF
INCITEMENT AND ANTI-AMERICAN
AND ANTI-SEMITIC PROPAGANDA ON
AMERICAN INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE MIDDLE EAST
AND SOUTH ASIA

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 18, 2002

Serial No. 107-82

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.house.gov/international_relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

78-802PDF

WASHINGTON : 2002

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York	TOM LANTOS, California
JAMES A. LEACH, Iowa	HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska	GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey	ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
DAN BURTON, Indiana	DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
ELTON GALLEGLY, California	ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida	SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
CASS BALENGER, North Carolina	CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, Georgia
DANA ROHRABACHER, California	EARL F. HILLIARD, Alabama
EDWARD R. ROYCE, California	BRAD SHERMAN, California
PETER T. KING, New York	ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	JIM DAVIS, Florida
AMO HOUGHTON, New York	ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York	WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT, Massachusetts
JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana	GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado	BARBARA LEE, California
RON PAUL, Texas	JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York
NICK SMITH, Michigan	JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL, Pennsylvania
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania	EARL BLUMENAUER, Oregon
DARRELL E. ISSA, California	SHELLEY BERKLEY, Nevada
ERIC CANTOR, Virginia	GRACE NAPOLITANO, California
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona	ADAM B. SCHIFF, California
BRIAN D. KERNS, Indiana	DIANE E. WATSON, California
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	
MARK GREEN, Wisconsin	

THOMAS E. MOONEY, SR., *Staff Director/General Counsel*

ROBERT R. KING, *Democratic Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York, *Chairman*

DAN BURTON, Indiana	GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio	HOWARD L. BERMAN, California
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York	BRAD SHERMAN, California
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania	ROBERT WEXLER, Florida
DARRELL E. ISSA, California	ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
ERIC CANTOR, Virginia	JOSEPH CROWLEY, New York
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia	JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL, Pennsylvania
DANA ROHRABACHER, California	SHELLEY BERKLEY, Nevada
PETER T. KING, New York	ADAM B. SCHIFF, California
JOHN COOKSEY, Louisiana	

HILLEL WEINBERG, *Subcommittee Staff Director & Counsel*

DAVID S. ADAMS, *Democratic Professional Staff Member*

DEBORAH BODLANDER, *Professional Staff Member*

PAUL BERKOWITZ, *Professional Staff Member*

MATTHEW ZWEIG, *Staff Associate*

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESSES	
Martin S. Indyk, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy Studies, The Brookings Institution	5
Abraham H. Foxman, National Director, Anti-Defamation League	9
Yigal Carmon, President, The Middle East Media Research Institution	18
LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING	
The Honorable Benjamin A. Gilman, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, and Chairman, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia: Prepared statement	2
Abraham H. Foxman: Prepared statement	13
Yigal Carmon: Prepared statement	20
APPENDIX	
Material Submitted for the Hearing Record	29

**WORDS HAVE CONSEQUENCES: THE IMPACT
OF INCITEMENT AND ANTI-AMERICAN AND
ANTI-SEMITIC PROPAGANDA ON AMERICAN
INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST**

THURSDAY, APRIL 18, 2002

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11 a.m. in Room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

Mr. GILMAN. The Subcommittee will come to order.

Anti-Americanism, tainted with anti-Semitism, set the stage for the vicious attacks on New York and Washington on September 11, 2001. As a result, today we find ourselves facing an ideological enemy, an enemy that may turn out to be harder to defeat than al-Qaeda or the Taliban: The fanatical anti-American and anti-Semitic incitement that has permeated the Arab world.

This propaganda constitutes a real threat to long-term U.S. interests in the region, and does great damage to the prospects for real and a lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, and to the bilateral relations between our Nation and our allies in the Arab world.

It has created a culture of hatred, a culture of hatred directed against the United States and our allies, which serves as an impediment to our ability to foster meaningful bilateral relations with nations throughout the region. It also restricts the ability of regional governments to act decisively when the time comes to make peace or to establish diplomatic relations with our Nation or with Israel.

The Bush Administration shares these concerns. It has called on the Arab states to stop the hatred in the press against Israel or against Jews. Chairman Hyde has introduced legislation that has widespread support on our Committee. That legislation requires the Secretary of State to make public diplomacy an integral component in the planning and execution of U.S. foreign policy and in getting our message out to the Arab world.

And we in the Congress want to see peace. We want to see stability and security prevail, not only in Israel and the West Bank in Gaza, but throughout the Middle East region as a whole. Yet that is highly unlikely when Yasser Arafat's state-controlled educational system continues to encourage their children to view them-

selves as future martyrs and taught that the Jew is deceitful, treacherous, an enemy of Islam and the Arabs, and the Jews constitute a danger to their very existence.

The resulting portrayal of the Jewish human being as worthy of physical annihilation is particularly appalling. In comparison to some other Arab leaders, Mr. Arafat has done nothing to prepare his people for a future peace with Israel. Yet this has gained a wider regional appeal where television and radio broadcasts continue to revel in nonstop incitement.

All of the ancient canards and lies about Jews have been revived in the public arena communication, including the revival of the ancient blood rival by the government-controlled press in Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The pervasiveness of the Holocaust denial and the widespread assertion by mainstream Arabic press that the Jews were responsible for the attack on the World Trade Center.

However, even if a political settlement suitable to the governments involved were arrived at tomorrow, anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism would probably not abate, and would cause difficulties for most of the moderate governments. It has become too useful a smoke screen for their nations many problems, their internal corruption, their incompetence, their lack of legitimacy, the oppression of their own citizens that clearly demonstrates a need for the development of democratic governance and the rule of law in that area.

We are not calling for censorship, but I believe there needs to be a clear, conclusive and deliberate effort by the governments of the region to officially and publicly repudiate the purveyors of anti-American and anti-Semitic hatred. We must help those nations build a culture of tolerance on which a prospect for real peace can flourish by calling on the leadership of the Arab world to make such rhetoric politically and culturally unacceptable. Only a concerted multifaceted approach to combating this virulent propaganda will effectively silence it.

Anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism must be answered. It must be fought with all the means at our disposal, and that is why we hope our witnesses today can make some cogent suggestions about what can be done to counter this hatred.

This morning we will be hearing testimony from Ambassador Martin Indyk, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute; Abraham Foxman, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League; and Yigal Carmon, President of the Middle East Media Research Institute.

I call on my Ranking Member, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Ackerman, for any opening statement he may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gilman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AND CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Anti-Americanism, tainted with anti-Semitism, set the stage for the vicious attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2001. As a result, today we find ourselves facing an ideological enemy that may turn out to be harder to defeat than Al-Qaeda or the Taliban: the fanatical anti-American and anti-Semitic incitement that permeates the Arab world. This propaganda constitutes a real threat to long-term U.S. interests in the region, and does great damage to the prospects for a real and lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, and to the bilateral relations between the United States and its allies in the Arab world. It creates a culture

of hatred directed at the United States and our allies, which serves as an impediment to our ability to foster meaningful bilateral relations with nations throughout the region. It also restricts the ability of regional governments to act decisively when the time comes to make peace or to establish diplomatic relations with the United States or Israel.

The Bush Administration shares these concerns. It has “called on the Arab states to stop the hatred in the press against Israel or against Jews.” Chairman Hyde has introduced legislation that has widespread support on the Committee, which will require the Secretary of State to make public diplomacy an integral component in the planning and execution of U.S. foreign policy, aimed at getting our message out to the Arab world.

We in the Congress want to see peace, stability, and security prevail, not only in Israel, the West Bank, and Gaza, but throughout the region as a whole. Yet, that is highly unlikely, when Yasser Arafat’s state-controlled educational system continues to encourage children to view themselves as future martyrs. They are taught that the Jew is deceitful, treacherous, the enemy of Islam and the Arabs, and that Jews constitute a danger to their very existence. The resulting portrayal of the Jewish human being as worthy of physical annihilation is particularly infuriating. In comparison to some other Arab leaders, Arafat has done nothing to prepare his people for peace with Israel.

Yet, this has gained a wider regional appeal, where television and radio broadcasts continue to revel in nonstop incitement. All of the ancient canards and lies about Jews have been revived in the public arena of communication. These include the revival of the “blood libel” by the government-controlled press in Egypt and Saudi Arabia, the pervasiveness of the Holocaust denial, and the widespread assertion by the mainstream Arabic press that the Jews were responsible for the attack on the World Trade Center.

However, even if a political settlement suitable to the governments involved were arrived at tomorrow, anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism would probably not abate and would cause difficulties for most moderate governments. It has become too useful a smokescreen for their nations’ many problems—their corruption, incompetence, lack of legitimacy, oppression of their own citizens—that clearly demonstrates the need for the development of democratic governance and the rule of law.

We are not calling for censorship, but I believe that there needs to be a clear, conclusive and deliberate effort by the governments of the region to *officially and publicly* repudiate the purveyors of anti-American and anti-Semitic hatred. We must help these nations build a culture of tolerance on which the prospect of real peace can flourish by calling on the leadership of the Arab world to make such rhetoric politically and culturally unacceptable.

Only a concerted, multifaceted approach to combating this virulent propaganda will effectively silence it. Anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism must be answered and fought with all the means at our disposal, and that is why we hope our witnesses today can make some cogent suggestions about what can be done to counter this hatred.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening today’s hearing.

While our armed forces remain engaged in a vital and deadly struggle against the menace of global terrorism, I believe it is highly appropriate for our Subcommittee to look at one of the key elements of the struggle that has received considerably less attention than the dramatic movements of troops and ships and planes.

There is no question that our enemies have used technology and communication to facilitate their barbaric assault on our Nation and the values that we hold dear. But we must also recognize that they and their ideological allies have utilized these technologies in the Middle East in a less direct, but no less insidious fashion.

On September 11 the attacks against us were perpetrated by deceit, by murderers hiding their intent under a peaceful exterior as airline travelers. The attacks of today come in the form of hijackers, truck bombs and the like. But the terrorists with whom we are now engaged are intent on not only destroying the people and society of today, but are seeking to assault the minds and hopes of future generations as well. This assault on the future comes in a dif-

ferent form—as propaganda and the preaching of gospel of hatred, bitterness and inhumanity.

Our enemies both in al-Qaeda and among those who merely share their beliefs call upon the frustrations of the Arab world and seek to distill the raw material of alienation and disappointment into the poison of terrorism and violence.

America's preeminence in the world has two components: the hard element of raw economic, political and military power, and the soft element of our ideals, values and examples of our diverse, free and prosperous society. These two kinds of power are complementary and have enabled our country not only to rise to a position of sole superpower but to do so without provoking a sustained international reaction to counter this trend.

But soft power can be used against us as well, and this is what we are here to discuss today; the use of words that diminish the humanity of others, the use of words to incite hatred of others, and the inevitability of the use of words to inspire violence against others.

We have seen this process before. Indeed, only a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, you and I and some of our witnesses today, and many others, Members of Congress who were here gathered in the rotunda of the Capitol to remember the Holocaust and to repeat the bitter lesson we learned from the Nazis—never again.

Never again can we sit back and listen to hate speech pour into newspapers and broadcast media without responding. Never again can we allow political and civil leaders in other countries the privilege of apathy as segments of their society or nations on their borders are demonized and calls for war are let loose. Never again can the United States fail to confront the purveyors of hatred on the assumption that things will turn out okay.

The reality, Mr. Chairman, as we well know, is that today in the Middle East and in today's Europe there is a flood of exactly the sort of incitement and bigotry the world saw in Europe before World War II: calls for murder and celebration of the same; lies repeated endless in order to devalue the truth; slurs and caricatures spread and reproduced until their outrageousness becomes merely commonplace; and always with the same goals—to undermine support for our Nation's just war on terrorism, to justify barbarism and slaughter in the pursuit of ideological or religious extremism, to delegitimize the governments in the region that have chosen to stand with us, and let's be clear, to prepare peoples' minds for the annihilation of the State of Israel.

Hate speech matters. We have seen its consequences too clearly to deny this. Peace and reconciliation in the Middle East is the goal of the United States, and I would like to believe of all our partners in the region. But the question is what our partners in the region are doing at home to make this goal a reality. What are they doing to confront the emergence of mendacity, those whose goal is war, strife and bloodshed? Have they confronted the proponents of hate? Have they mobilized the decent and silent majorities in their countries to challenge them? Or have they been silent, cowed by the rage of the war monger and the bigot in his furious claim of legitimacy?

How these questions are answered in the coming days will have more to do with the future of the Middle East than many people realize. This is a critical time for the nations of the Middle East as much as it is for our own Nation, Mr. Chairman. I hope that we will rise to the challenge that we face.

Again, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for scheduling this very important hearing, and I look forward to receiving the testimony of our extremely distinguished panel of witnesses today.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Ackerman.

Does any of our other Members—do any of our other Members want to make an opening statement?

If not, we will proceed with our first witness. Ambassador Indyk is a former Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, and Ambassador of the United States to Israel. He spent his career building bridges of peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and is currently a senior fellow at the prestigious Brookings Institution in Washington where he works on Middle East policy.

And Ambassador Indyk, you may proceed. We ask you to try to limit your testimony, but will submit your full statement for the record.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN S. INDYK, SENIOR FELLOW, FOREIGN POLICY STUDIES, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

Mr. INDYK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a real honor to appear before you again in this distinguished Middle East Subcommittee, and I thank you for the invitation.

Your hearing today provides an important opportunity to highlight the central importance of words and images in the protection of American values and interests, and in the promotion of policies that can help reduce conflict and create a more positive environment for compromise and reconciliation in the trouble-torn Middle East.

We meet at a time when this region is in turmoil. The “Arab Street,” as it has come to be called, after a decade’s long slumber has awoken in anger as images of bloodshed and words of hate have finally succeeded in inciting tens of thousands of people to express their anti-American and anti-Israeli sentiments through demonstrations and rioting.

But as we know, and as your Committee in particular knows, this is just the latest manifestation of the phenomenon that you are examining today.

Some argue that it is the United States that is to blame. It is because of U.S. policy that this kind of thing is happening. But I would just point out, Mr. Chairman, that throughout the last decade when the United States was making a Herculean effort to make peace in the Middle East, to reconcile Israelis and Arabs, we were dogged every step of the way by a hate-filled environment in which official organs of the Arab states, as well as other means of communication, were pouring out a litany of incitement to their people and creating the very dry undergrowth—ripe for the conflagration when the spark came.

And this problem is not just in the context of the Arab-Israeli conflict. From my own experience, we can see how anti-American, anti-Semitic incitement plagued our Iraq policy. Iraqi propaganda

managed to persuade Arab public opinion that the United States was responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of Iraqi babies because of our insistence on maintaining sanctions on Iraq until Saddam Hussein complied with the U.N. Security Council resolutions on weapons of mass destruction.

Despite the fact that there was no ban on the import of food and medicines to Iraq, despite the fact that we made arrangements—which became known as the Oil-for-Food Arrangements providing the Iraqis with some \$18 billion a year to feed and care for their people, nothing we could do could change the impact of the images and the rhetoric that were being spread throughout the Arab world, the images of baby coffins on the roofs of Iraqi taxis being paraded around Baghdad for the benefit of CNN.

The question I have been asked to address today is what kind of policy should be pursued to counter the obviously deleterious impact of incitement on our values, interests and policies in the region.

The first point I would want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we did not just discover that we had a problem with Arab public opinion after September 11th of last year. This is a problem that has been around for decades. I know that you have had hearings on this subject before September 11th. It is a problem that Congress and successive Administrations have tried to address through appropriations, through the institutionalization of what became known in the State Department as “Public Diplomacy,” and it has also been addressed in agreements that the United States helped negotiate. There is in fact a whole chapter on anti-incitement in the Oslo Agreements, and the Wye Agreement that was brokered by President Clinton set up an American-led, anti-incitement committee to try to deal with these problems.

No doubt we can and should do a better job. We can and should put more resources into such things as Arab programming, Arabic-speaking spokesmen for the United States, and we should definitely utilize the very professional people in our embassies who are trained for this job in the Arab world for a more aggressive program of putting across our point of view. No doubt we also have to recognize the impact of the Al-Jazeera phenomenon as we try to develop an effective policy. The fact that satellite TV is bringing news and images in Arabic to the Arab world and giving voice to a broad range of opinions, most of them extreme in their anti-Americanism and anti-Semitic sentiments, is something that we have to recognize and deal with. We have to compete with those views in Arabic, not just with people who are fluent in the language, but with people who understand the culture and who can make the argument in terms that will be readily accepted. I want to give you two quick examples of this.

We thought that we could win the propaganda campaign against Saddam Hussein by showing pictures of the palaces that he was building while he was starving his people. What we did not understand was that in Arab culture the leader is supposed to have palaces. That was not a particularly negative image as far as they were concerned.

Compare that with the dramatic impact that the image of Afghani people celebrating the downfall of the Taliban had on Arab

public opinion. When they saw that the people of Afghanistan actually welcomed the downfall of the Taliban regime, they understood something that we could not convince them of through statements or interviews by our American-accented spokesman.

But the real conclusion that I want to emphasize today after years of experience in trying to deal with this challenge is that on our own we simply cannot win this battle for the hearts and minds of the Arab world no matter how much money we throw at it, no matter how effective we become at the image game. To stop the incitement and to create a more hospitable environment for peace-making and the promotion of American interests in the Middle East, there is one critical ingredient that is usually absent from the panoply of tools we bring to bear on this problem. That critical ingredient, Mr. Chairman, is Arab leadership.

The reality in the Arab world is that the state is all pervasive in the lives of its people. The state controls the media. The state manipulates public opinion. The state in effect tells people how to think. And the state has become immensely effective in doing this. They have been doing it for decades, and for decades it has been convenient for them to deflect the anti-regime dissent and anger amongst their own population, to deflect it onto the United States and onto Israel. And having created that monster, they were then afraid to reign it in because it could refocus the anger and resentment back onto the regimes themselves.

It is only in the extreme case when the leadership feels that its relations with Washington are actually threatened by this phenomenon or when it threatens to drag them back into a war with Israel, only then might they stand up and lead their public opinion. You see it very clearly today in what is going on in Egypt where the streets are full and the papers and the television is full of calls for going back to war with Israel. Where is the Arab army? Where is the Egyptian army? These are the questions that are being asked by the demonstrators in the streets of Cairo today.

And President Mubarak, because he fears that Egypt's vital interests will be affected if this kind of rhetoric takes hold, stands up to his public opinion and says

“This is against Egyptian interest and we will not go back to war.”

I think perhaps the best example of this is the phenomenon of suicide bombing. Before September 11th, Hamas and Islamic Jihad in the West Bank and Gaza had developed these kinds of suicide bombings into an art form, an evil art form. This kind of bombing was welcomed, even celebrated in the Arab world and in the Arab media as “martyrdom operations.” No distinction was drawn between civilians and combatants. If they were Israelis, they were fair game.

September 11th, however, showed how dangerous this approach could be when 19 Saudis and Egyptians went on just such “martyrdom” missions that killed more than 3,000 innocent people. And in the wake of this, under intense scrutiny and pressure from the United States, the Saudi and Egyptian leadership, in particular, stood up and spoke to their people and told them that this is unac-

ceptable, that this is against Islam, that Islam does not condone the killing of innocents.

And when the argument was made by some in the Arab world that there was good terrorism and bad terrorism, that September 11th was bad terrorism but it was okay to conduct the same kinds of attacks against Israel, these leaders stood up and said no, and they had the Grand Mufti of Saudi Arabia and the Sheik Al-Azhar in Cairo issue rulings saying that such kinds of operations were against Islam, and they specifically made clear that their ruling applied to innocent civilians in Israel. Crown Prince Abdallah spoke to his clerics in public and told them watch out, "you know who is watching you," tone down your rhetoric, moderate your opinion. And President Mubarak did the same thing.

And in that context, as the leaders opened up some political space within their own media for a different point of view, a more moderate, more tolerant, less hateful point of view, we saw the thin, small voices start to express themselves, start to stand up and say to their people "it is time that we looked ourselves in the mirror instead of blaming the United States or Israel for the fate that has befallen us." And so we had the beginnings of, if you like, a new dawn; just the beginnings.

Unfortunately, as a result of the escalation in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the last 2 months, and as a result of repeated suicide attacks by Hamas, Islamic Jihad and now the Tanzim militants, who have even resorted to using 16-year-old girls in this evil mission, we see again in the face of their enraged public opinions that the leaders have gone silent. Sheik Tantawi, the Sheik Al-Azhar, has actually backtracked and now justifies the killing of innocent civilians if they are Israelis. And despite the pressure from the United States, from the President himself, there has been no willingness on the part of these leaders, our friends and allies in the region, to stand up and condemn what they now again call "martyrdom operations," instead they now use telethons, television fund raising campaigns, to support these operations.

How do we deal with this phenomenon?

First of all we have to take it to the Arab leaders. We have to get them to be more responsible.

Secondly, and here I think that the Congress can do something very useful, we have to scrutinize what is going on. We are going to hear from Mr. Carmon. I think you know, Mr. Chairman, that MEMRI does an excellent job of scrutinizing what is put out in the Arab press and on Arab television. We have in the U.S. Government an ability to monitor all of these broadcasts through the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, and it is publicly available information.

But I wonder whether the time has not come for the Congress to set up a congressional watchdog office, perhaps in the Congressional Research Service, that would issue reports to the Congress as well as obviously making it available to the Administration and to the public that would highlight the kind of anti-Israeli, anti-American, anti-Semitic rhetoric that is being spewed out of these media outlets. Then you will be in the position to use that in your own dialogues with the Arab leadership to get them to act more responsibly in this situation.

If we do that, Mr. Chairman, if you decide to go down that road, I would just conclude by saying it is very important that in conducting this dialogue with the Arab leadership that we do it with respect, with sensitivity, with objectivity in terms of making sure that we also recognize the incitement that is in our own press and in the Israeli press at the same time. It does not come close in comparison, but in order to be effective we need also to be balanced and objective in this.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Ambassador Indyk.

Our next panelist is Abraham Foxman, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League, one of the nation's prime civil rights agencies, which has been combating anti-Semitism and bigotry of all kinds for some 88 years.

Mr. Foxman is a Holocaust survivor and is a recognized authority on the Holocaust and on Jewish resistance to the Nazis.

Mr. Foxman, you may put your statement in full in the record, and if you would be kind enough to try to summarize. Thank you, Mr. Foxman.

**STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR,
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE**

Mr. FOXMAN. Thank you. We are grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Committee for holding these important hearings, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to share with you some observations.

In the United States, the Anti-Defamation League has developed proactive anti-bias education programs designed to target precisely the kind of intolerance and hate speech that today fuels terrorism and impedes peace negotiations in the Middle East.

While we have had some success in translating our programs into other languages and contexts, the task of sharing the American experience of combating bigotry is complex.

While those with jurisdiction over defense tend to America's work in Afghanistan, and those of you with appropriations responsibility provide resources, and the rest of Congress seeks to keep our Nation economically sound, Mr. Chairman, it is very appropriate and timely for us to meet this morning and for this Committee to consider a broad U.S. policy approach to the rhetoric and incitement abroad which nurtures an environment where terrorism breed.

We Americans who cherish our freedom of speech and freedom of the press know very well the power of words. As a Holocaust survivor, I know very well the meaning and the power of words, for words were the first weapons in Hitler's final solution of the Jews. The gas chambers, the crematoria did not begin with bricks. They began with words, ugly words, hateful words. And it was, Mr. Chairman, the absence of words, the absence of deeds, the absence of response that permitted those words to become the bricks of the crematoria.

As we have witnessed historically and in today's world, such charged rhetoric invites violent action. Incitement creates an environment conducive to and accepting of terrorism. As the U.S. and other nations join in a battle against worldwide terrorism, there

must be renewed vigilance against purveyors of anti-Semitism and anti-American hatred.

The President has launched a campaign against nations who harbor terrorists and seek weapons of mass destruction. Americans learned a painful lesson on 9–11 that purveyors of hatred are also trafficking in the very potent weapon of mass destruction. The dehumanization of the other breeds incitement and violence.

The ADL has been ever mindful that hateful words can lead to violence for September 11th did not begin with box cutters or pilot manuals. It also began with the teaching of contempt, the same stereotyping, scapegoating and dehumanization which enabled populations of Europe to accept the marginalization and near annihilation of Jews as somehow tolerable. Today, much of this is also directed against America.

As people who value pluralism, religious freedom and tolerance, Americans and Jews have been targets of choice for extremists. We have seen that where Jews are scapegoated and demonized, anti-American rhetoric flourishes as well.

For many years, anti-Semitism in the Arab world was seen as a marginal issue. Manifestations of Jew hatred were attributed to an ongoing resentment stemming from the hostilities between Israel and the Arabs rather than to a deep-seated prejudice.

Now that we are simultaneously witnessing the unraveling of the hopes for peace and a spirit of anti-Semitism, it forces us to take another look at the connection between anti-Semitism, efforts to dehumanize Jews or Americans, and the terrorism against Israel and America.

The Arab media has been relentless in solidifying a culture of hatred around Israel and the Jewish religion. In late November, even after sensitivity about stereotyping and fermenting hatred should have been an all-time high, Abu Dhabi television, one of the most popular stations in the Arab world, aired a comedy about Prime Minister Sharon drinking the blood of Arab children, a revival of the infamous Jewish blood libel, and the response to critiques from the United States and others was, “What’s the matter? Can’t you enjoy a joke?”

References to a new era of Hitleric Zionism abound in Arab state-sponsored press. Just like any other campaign of deligitimization one has to know one’s audience, and in some environments, such as in Durban, South Africa, branding Israel as an apartheid regime was the most potent message.

In others, especially in Europe, equating Jews with Nazis is just as powerful. The examples of this horrendous comparison are too numerous to cite in these remarks, and I have provided the Members of the Committee with just a sampling of cartoons which make that hideous comparison.

In the past, Arab leaders bemoaned the Holocaust as unfortunate because it fueled support, they said, for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in the Middle East. They expressed the view that Europeans hated and persecuted Jews while they loved them and tolerated them, but in the end it fell to the Arab Middle East to pay the price for that persecution.

But now all of a sudden there is another approach to the Holocaust which has arisen in the Middle East, and that is to deny that

it ever occurred. In some cases, Holocaust denial is actively sponsored by national governments, such as Iran and Syria, and in other Middle Eastern countries, it is adopted by opposition parties and dissident factions that oppose attempts at normalizing relations with Israel and the United States.

The difference between a tolerant and uncivil society does not lie the biases within the hearts of its people, but in the public reaction of its leaders to manifestations of hate and bigotry. In our own country, as survivors were still being rescued from ground zero, President Bush issued a strong call against stereotyping and hate against the Arabs, Muslims and Middle Eastern looking neighbors in these United States.

Similarly, the first ad that was published by the Anti-Defamation League after 9–11 was a call against stereotyping of Muslims calling on Americans not to “fight hatred with hatred.” ADL has spoken out unequivocally against those extremists who resort to violence, Jews and non-Jews alike.

In Israel when public officials have made racist slurs, they face censure by their own government and Jewish organizations worldwide. The Anti-Defamation League issues public statements condemning such statements whether they come from generals or members of Knesset. Violent Jewish extremists groups are outlawed and branded as terrorists in Israel just as they are in the United States.

Throughout the Arab world, however, instead of responding with disgust and condemnation, leaders, and even their emissaries in Washington, rigorously defend these ugly pictures as legitimate manifestations of political commentary. Presidents, poets, and religious leaders, with few but welcome exceptions as Ambassador Indyk pointed out, glorify suicide bombers and defend the hatred and the bigotry.

The United States, Mr. Chairman, must not allow Arafat, Mubarak or other leaders in the Arab world to think that they can ignore, tolerate or encourage anti-Semitism in their societies with impunity. It is hard enough to overcome the political and nationalistic problems that stand in the way of a Palestinian-Israeli peace. The spreading of anti-Semitic incitement—blood libel charges, conspiracy theories, comparing Israel to Hitler, Holocaust denial—will only further embitter the peoples of both sides and make good faith peace negotiations an even more distant dream.

Mr. Chairman, America’s interest in holding governments such as Egypt accountable for their inaction is not to single them out for special treatment, but rather to treat them as responsible, equal members of the community of nations. Failing to hold them to a certain standard of moral leadership and excusing their failure to promote civil society patronizes rather than respects Arab leaders. The events of September 11th showed that, for the sake of our own interests, Americans can ill afford as a Nation to have a double standard in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, Americans will not be truly secure until and unless we confront the proliferation of this anti-Semitic, anti-American incitement. A new generation of Americans has learned about the vital necessity of promoting tolerance as a critical weapon defending our Nation’s security interest.

Fortunately, we also have witnessed in our lifetime powerful examples of how strong U.S. leadership in placing human rights up front and center on the diplomatic agenda has brought about dramatic change. When Presidents, Vice Presidents, Secretaries of State, and Members of Congress forced issues like religious freedom onto the diplomatic agenda, we witnessed the release of Soviet Refuseniks, the spread of other freedoms across the former Soviet Union, and ultimately the fall of the evil empire.

We know from our own experience that we cannot police hearts and minds, and that bigotry cannot be legislated out of existence. We cannot outlaw hate, but we can rally nations around a credo of tolerance. We can promote and reward morally responsible actions from government leaders and punish failures.

Incitement flourishes in precisely those parts of the world where human rights and free speech are the most limited. Hatred of Jews or Americans is not an expression of freedom, but rather it is a cynically used to divert energy and focus from the lack of freedoms which plague these societies.

Moreover, it is all too clear that this kind of barrage, if continued over time, will poison the minds of many in the Arab world so that hatred of Jews, hatred of the U.S., will indeed become a way of life as never before.

Just as Congress and successive Administrations have addressed nations who traffic in weapon of mass destruction, narcotics, women and children, we should leverage the full range of our policy and economic pressure on nations who traffic in the weaponry of hate and incitement. Using existing models we should punish incitement as we do forms of business corruption while providing incentives for all countries to become integrated into the community of nations. While some nations incentivize murder, we will reward tolerance.

Place the issue of incitement, ladies and gentlemen, squarely on the U.S. diplomatic agenda to be raised by Presidents and cabinet secretaries in all bilateral fora. America cannot conduct bilateral relations without addressing incitement against America and its allies as a threat to the interest.

We urge Congress and the Bush Administration to establish a presidential commission to study the nature and scope of this problem and to recommend U.S. policy responses to incitement. The commission could explore the vast array of policy options. American participants in the U.S.-Israel-Palestinian Anti-Incitement Committee noted that a central obstacle was a fundamental disagreement with the Palestinian representatives about the nature of the problem. I believe that a domestic U.S. forum to consider meaningful policy responses would be an important effort and would help establish some of the criteria.

Gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, we may not have all the answers but the first step is to shine the light on the problem, expose its danger and report on the performances of governments in responding. As we have seen in other policy areas, annual reporting on incitement would provide an incentive for governments to demonstrate progress in dealing with the problem. From now on, the State Department's Annual Country Reports on Human Rights should in-

clude a section on each nation's compliance with international treaties and norms against incitement.

Anti-bias education is an essential building block of America's public diplomacy. Our experience has exposed a broad lack of understanding of what distinguishes legitimate political criticism from stereotyping. Using the existing public diplomacy apparatus, international visitor exchange, professional development, democratization programs must focus on the issue of incitement.

Mr. Chairman, one of the essential lessons of the Holocaust is that words lead to murder; that the teaching of contempt, the tolerating of bigotry and anti-Semitism can lead to genocide. We never expected in the 21st century, after the world bore witness to the Holocaust, that we would have to defend basic notions of freedom and tolerance which we hoped would distinguish this century from the last. But do so we must armed with the clear knowledge that we can make a difference.

Many of us have had our hopes for a peaceful post cold war era and regional cooperation in the Middle East shattered. We must now strive for a more measured goal—promoting tolerance and rejecting hatred. Some had once hoped that resolving political conflict would lead to a cessation of violence and hatred. We now know that the inverse is true. Conflicts will flare until political leaders use their bully puppets to promote an atmosphere of tolerance. While it may take generations for some conflicts to truly end, we must begin a dialogue about what mechanisms can be put in place to foster respect for basic norms of civility and tolerance.

Arab anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism, if allowed to flourish, could become of the most destructive forces unleashed in this new century. History has shown us where this can lead. Combating it right now must not be the task only of non-governmental organizations such as the ADL. For the sake of peace and a stable, sane world, responsible governments everywhere must speak up. This battle will not be won until we can change the minds and hearts of those leaders who permit anti-Jewish, anti-American, and anti-Israel propaganda to proliferate.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to share these thoughts with you. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Foxman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

I am Abraham Foxman, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League. ADL has worked to expose and counter anti-Semitism and all forms of bigotry since 1913. We are grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Committee, for holding these important hearings and I am pleased to have the opportunity to share some observations and entertain any questions.

In the US, we have developed proactive anti-bias education programs designed to target precisely the kind of intolerance and hate speech that fuels terrorism and impedes peace negotiations in the Middle East. While we have had some success in translating our programs into other languages and contexts, the task of sharing the American experience of combating bigotry is complex.

While those with jurisdiction over defense tend to America's war in Afghanistan, and appropriators provide resources, and Congress seeks to keep our nation economically sound, it is appropriate and timely for this Committee to consider a broad US policy approach to the rhetoric of incitement abroad which nurtures an environment where terrorism can breed.

We Americans who cherish our freedom of speech and freedom of the press know very well the power of words. As a Holocaust survivor I know very well the power

of words. Words were the first weapon in Hitler's Final Solution for the Jews. He had to speak against Jews, conjure up hateful images of Jews, in order to dehumanize them in the hearts and minds of the Germans and garner their support. And he succeeded all too well. Before there were bricks to build the crematoria, there were words—hateful, ugly words.

As we have witnessed, historically and in today's world, such charged rhetoric invites violent action. Incitement creates an environment conducive to, and accepting of, terrorism. As the U.S. and other nations join in the battle against worldwide terrorism, there must be renewed vigilance against purveyors of anti-Semitism and anti-American hatred.

HATRED: WEAPON OF MASS DESTRUCTION AND OBSTACLE TO PEACE

The President has launched a campaign against nations who harbor terrorists and seek weapons of mass destruction. America learned a painful lesson on 9/11—that purveyors of hatred are also traffickers in a very potent weapon of mass destruction. The dehumanization of “the other” breeds incitement and violence. It proliferates, generating an unlimited supply of individuals who themselves, through their willingness to kill, are tools of mass destruction and pose an imminent danger to America's national security.

ADL has been ever mindful that hateful words can lead to violence. September 11th did not begin with box-cutters and pilots manuals. It began with the teaching of contempt—the same stereotyping, scapegoating and dehumanization which enabled populations of Europe to accept the, marginalization and near annihilation of Jews as somehow tolerable.

As peoples who value pluralism, religious freedom, and tolerance, Americans, and Jews have been the targets of choice for extremists. We have seen that, where Jews are scapegoated and demonized, incendiary anti-American rhetoric flourishes as well.

Long before the September 11th attacks, observers of the Middle East peace process had learned a painful lesson about the effects of deeply rooted hatred. Peace accords are difficult to reach in an atmosphere of enmity and, once signed, they are mere scraps of paper if not reinforced by democratic institutions and peace education to lay the ground for people to live side-by-side in mutual respect.

One does not need to focus on the extreme images of flaring Israeli-Palestinian violence as an illustration. Consider the Israel-Egypt peace accords. While, thankfully, Israel has not been attacked by its southern neighbor, an entire generation has come of age in Egypt suckled on images of the Jews as demon, conqueror, and butcher. This rampant enmity toward Jews and Israelis—paid for and sanctioned by the government—quashes any hope for normalized relations between Egyptians and Israelis.

EVOLVING ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE ARAB WORLD

For many years anti-Semitism in the Arab world was seen as a marginal issue. Manifestations of Jew hatred were attributed to the ongoing resentments stemming from the hostilities between Israel and the Arabs rather than to any deep-seated prejudice. Now that we are simultaneously witnessing the unraveling of hopes for peace and a spurt of Arab anti-Semitism, it forces us to take another look at the connection between anti-Semitism, efforts to dehumanize Jews or Americans, and the terrorism against Israel and America.

The Scapegoating Impulse.

Throughout history, when Jew-hatred has become embedded in a society, it has risen to the surface during times of crisis. We witnessed this first hand after September 11th.

While Jews have been scapegoated and libeled throughout history, the conspiracy-mongers of the Arab world, including leaders of nations like Syria, took anti-Israel propaganda to a whole new level in promoting the myth that Israel and Jews were responsible for the attack in an effort to create a backlash against Arabs, Islam and Palestinians.

The *Frontier Post* of Peshawar, Pakistan, reported that it obtained information from a “U.S. intelligence source” confirming that an internal intelligence memo “pointed to the threat of a covert Israeli operation on U.S. soil.”

The *Tehran Times* reported a fabricated statement by former national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, reporting he had told the TV network Al Jazeera, “Currently, there are two sorts of terrorism in the world. First, state-sponsored terrorism, the best example of which in the world is the Zionist regime, which is supported by the U.S. and the U.K.”

Syria's ambassador to Tehran, Tarky Muhammad Saqer, claimed that Syria has "documented evidence" of Israel's involvement. "Zionists pursued certain goals by conducting the attacks," Saqer reportedly told Iran's Foreign Affairs Ministry. Those "goals" included turning attention away from the UN World Conference Against Racism.

As we have witnessed time and again, such charged rhetoric invites extremists to step in with violent action. It creates an environment conducive to, and accepting of, terrorism. As the U.S. and other nations join in the battle against worldwide terrorism, there must be renewed vigilance against purveyors of anti-Semitism and anti-American hatred.

Dehumanizing Jews and Israel.

The Arab media have been relentless in solidifying a culture of hatred around Israel and the Jewish religion. In late November, even after sensitivity about stereotyping and fomenting hatred should have been at an all time high, Abu Dhabi television, one of the most popular stations in the Arab world, aired a comedy about Sharon drinking the blood of Arab children, a revival of the infamous Jewish blood libel.

How can Arabs help but sympathize with those who murder Israeli civilians when editorial writers and opinion leaders paint Jews and Israelis as utter demons? Just last week, as Secretary Powell was burning the midnight oil to do anything possible to reduce tensions on the ground, Al-Ahram, Egypt's government-funded "newspaper of record" ran an op ed saying: "Israel is a satanic growth, which does not have roots on earth and assembles all the elements of human anomalies." [Al-Ahram, 4/10/02]

Equating Jews with Nazis.

References to a "new era of 'Hitleric' Zionism" abound in Arab state-sponsored press. Just like any other campaign of delegitimization, one has to know one's audience. In some environments such as in Durban, South Africa, branding Israel an apartheid regime was the most potent message, in others, equating Jews with Nazis is just as powerful. The examples of this horrendous comparison are too numerous to cite in these remarks. I have provided Members of the Committee copies of cartoons which show just a few examples gathered in the few days leading up to this hearing.

Today, even the comparison with Nazism is not strong enough. The Syrian Times wrote that Hitler returning from the dead, would be insulted to be compared with Israel. It went on to say: "A comparison between the crimes committed by the racist Nazis and fascists is no more valid as Sharon's ugly crimes have extensively overrun those of Hitlerism. [Syrian Times, Editorial, April 11, 2002].

It is worth noting that the trend of equating Israelis with "barbaric Hitlerism" does not target a particular party in Israeli politics or a particular policy. We have documented Nazi caricatures targeting Israeli leaders from across the political spectrum—from Foreign Minister Shimon Peres to former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

Holocaust Denial.

In the past, Arab leaders bemoaned the Holocaust as unfortunate because it fueled support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in the Middle East. They expressed the view that Europeans hated and persecuted Jews but, in the end, it fell to the Arab Middle East to pay the price for that persecution.

But now another approach to the Holocaust has arisen in the Middle East: to deny it ever occurred. In some cases, Holocaust denial is actively sponsored by national governments, such as Iran and Syria. In other Middle Eastern countries, however, denying or minimizing the extent of the killing of Jews during World War II has been adopted by opposition parties and dissident factions that oppose attempts at normalizing relations—legal, diplomatic, economic—with Israel or the United States.

Holocaust denial now regularly appears throughout the Middle East—in speeches and pronouncements by public figures, in articles and columns by journalists, and in the resolutions of professional organizations. While some voices oppose this deliberate distortion of the historical record, the main tenet of Holocaust denial—that Jews invented the Holocaust story in an attempt to advance their own interests—appears to be an increasingly accepted belief for large numbers of people in Arab and Muslim states. The growing affinity for the Middle East demonstrated by Western Holocaust deniers—most hard-pressed by anti-hate legislation in their native countries—underscores the fact that the Middle East is one of the few regions in the world today where governments do not condemn, and sometimes even sponsor, such anti-Semitic propaganda.

RESPONSES TO INCITEMENT

The difference between a tolerant and an uncivil society does not lie in the biases within the hearts of its people, but in the public reaction of its leaders to manifestations of hate and bigotry. In our own country, as survivors were still being rescued from ground zero, President Bush issued a strong call against stereotyping and hate against Arabs, Muslims and Middle Eastern looking neighbors. Similarly, the first ad published by the Anti-Defamation League after 9/11 was a call against stereotyping of Muslims calling on Americans not to “fight hatred with hatred.” ADL has spoken out unequivocally against those extremists who resort to violence, Jews and non-Jews alike.

In Israel when public officials have made racist slurs, they face censure by their own government and Jewish organizations worldwide. The Anti-Defamation League issues public statements condemning such statements whether they come from IDF generals or Members of Knesset. Violent Jewish extremists groups are outlawed and branded as terrorists in Israel just as they are in the US.

Throughout the Arab world, instead of responding with disgust and condemnation, leaders, and even their emissaries in Washington, rigorously defend these ugly pictures as legitimate manifestations of political commentary. Presidents, poets, and religious leaders, with few but welcome exceptions, glorify suicide bombers. Recently, in Saudi Arabia, a national telethon reportedly raised over \$100 million for families of suicide and so-called “martyrs”—what we now call “incentivizing terrorism.” During the televised event, Islamic clergymen made calls for the destruction of Israel and America.

Ghazi Algosaibi, the Saudi Ambassador to the U.K. and noted poet, dedicated a poem entitled “Martyrs” to suicide bombers for whom he writes “the doors of heaven are opened.” He writes in the same poem about “the idols of a White House whose heart is filled with darkness. [The poem appeared on the front page of the London-based pan-Arab newspaper *Al Hayat*. April 12, 2002”]

Sadly, some European leaders have rationalized anti-Jewish attitudes and even violent attacks against Jews as nothing more than a sign of popular frustration with events in the Middle East—something to be expected, even understandable, under the circumstances.

As you know, for years, the Anti-Defamation League has met with President Mubarak time and again asking for a simple public condemnation of these images. He has refused our entreaties and those of this committee time after time. On his recent visit, President Mubarak refused even to sit with the ADL knowing we would raise the issue and pointedly ask him for what it appears he is unwilling to deliver.

In fact, President Mubarak of Egypt has responded to Members of Congress with a compilation of examples of what he calls anti-Arabism in Israeli newspapers. One example he cites of the “smearing of top Egyptian figures” is a quote by President Katzav of Israel saying: “President Hosni Mubarak bears a large share of responsibility for the negative image of Israel in Egypt because he takes no action against the atmosphere that allows the media in his country to present Israel as the major enemy of Egypt and the Arab world.” [Israel Radio, December 17, 2001]

The United States must not allow Arafat, Mubarak or other leaders in the Arab world to think that they can ignore, tolerate, or encourage anti-Semitism in their societies with impunity. It is hard enough to overcome the political and nationalistic problems that stand in the way of Palestinian-Israeli peace. The spreading of anti-Semitic incitement—blood libel charges, conspiracy theories, comparing Israel to Hitler, Holocaust denial—will only further embitter the peoples on both sides and make good faith peace negotiations an even more distant dream.

Mr. Chairman, America’s interest in holding governments such as Egypt accountable for their inaction is not to single them out for special treatment, but rather to treat them as responsible, equal members of the community of nations. Failing to hold them to a certain standard of moral leadership and excusing their failure to promote civil society patronizes rather than respects Arab leaders. The events of September 11th showed that, for the sake of our own interests America can ill afford as a nation to have a double standard in this regard.

LESSONS OF HISTORY

Mr. Chairman, Americans will not be truly secure until we confront the proliferation of this anti-Semitic, anti-American incitement. A new generation of Americans has learned about the vital necessity of promoting tolerance as a critical weapon defending our nation’s security interests.

Fortunately, we also have witnessed in our lifetime powerful examples of how strong US leadership in placing human rights front and center on the diplomatic agenda has brought about dramatic change. When Presidents, Vice Presidents, Sec-

retaries of State, and Members of Congress forced issues like religious freedom onto the diplomatic agenda, we witnessed the release of Soviet Refuseniks, the spread of other freedoms across the Former Soviet Union, and, ultimately, the fall of that regime.

We know from our own experience that we cannot police hearts and minds and that bigotry cannot be legislated out of existence. We cannot outlaw hate but we can rally nations around a credo of tolerance. We can promote and reward morally responsible action from government leaders and punish failures.

Incitement flourishes in precisely those parts of the world where human rights and free speech are the most limited. Hatred of Jews or Americans is not an expression of freedom but rather it is cynically used to divert energy and focus from the lack of freedoms which plague those societies.

Moreover, it is all too clear that this kind of barrage, if continued over time, will poison the minds of many in the Arab world so that hatred of Jews, hatred of the US, will indeed become a way of life as never before. The prospects this development would hold for greater violence, not only in the Middle East, but also around the world, are ignored at our own peril.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Just as Congress and successive administrations have addressed nations who traffic in weapons of mass destruction, narcotics, and in women and children, we should leverage the full range of our policy and economic pressure on nations who traffic in the weaponry of hatred and incitement. Using existing models we must punish incitement as we do forms of business corruption while providing incentives for all countries to become integrated into the community of nations. While some nations incentivize murder, we will reward tolerance.

1. *No Business as Usual.* Place the issue of incitement squarely on the US diplomatic agenda to be raised by Presidents and cabinet secretaries in all bilateral fora. American cannot conduct bilateral relations without addressing incitement against America and its allies as a threat to US interests.
2. *Craft a Long-Term Strategy.* We urge Congress and the Bush Administration to establish a Presidential Commission to study the nature and scope of this problem and to recommend US policy responses to incitement. The commission could explore the vast array of policy options. American participants in the US-Israel-Palestinian Anti-Incitement Committee noted that a central obstacle was a fundamental disagreement with the Palestinian representatives about the nature of the problem. A domestic US forum to consider meaningful policy responses would be an important effort.
3. *Spotlight the Problem.* We may not have all the answers but the first step is to shine a light on the problem, expose its danger and report on the performance of governments in responding. As we have seen in other policy areas, annual reporting on incitement would provide an incentive for governments to demonstrate progress in dealing with the problem. From now on, the State Department's Annual Country Reports on Human Rights should include a section on each nation's compliance with international treaties and norms against incitement.
4. *Anti-Bias Education* is an essential building block of America's public diplomacy. Our experience has exposed a broad lack of understanding of what distinguishes legitimate political criticism from stereotyping which can foment hatred and breed incitement. Using the existing public diplomacy apparatus, international visitor exchange, professional development, democratization programs must focus on the issue of incitement.

Mr. Chairman, one of the essential lessons of the Holocaust is that words lead to murder; that the teaching of contempt, the tolerating of bigotry and anti-Semitism can lead to genocide. We never expected in the 21st century, after the world bore witness to the Holocaust that we would have to defend basic notions of freedom and tolerance which we hoped would distinguish this century from the last. But do so we must armed with the clear knowledge that we can make a difference.

Many of us have had our hopes for a peaceful post cold war era and regional cooperation in the Middle East shattered. We must now strive for a more measured goal—promoting tolerance and rejecting hatred. Some had once hoped that resolving political conflict would lead to a cessation of violence and hatred. We now know the inverse is true. Conflicts will flare until political leaders use their bully pulpits to promote an atmosphere of tolerance. While it may take generations for some conflicts to truly end, we must begin a dialogue about what mechanisms can be put in place to foster respect for basic norms of civility and tolerance.

Arab anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism, if allowed to flourish, could become one of the most destructive forces unleashed in this new century. History has shown us where this can lead. Combating it right now must not be the task only of non-governmental organizations like the Anti-Defamation League. For the sake of peace and a stable, sane world, responsible governments everywhere must speak up. This battle will not be won until we can change the minds and hearts of those leaders who permit anti-Jewish, anti-American, and anti-Israel propaganda to proliferate.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Foxman for those comments.

We will now hear from Yigal Carmon, President. The Middle East Media Research Institution, an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit institute that provides timely translations of Arabic, Farshi, and Hebrew media, as well as original analysis and political ideological, intellectual, social, cultural, and religious trends in the Middle East.

Mr. Carmon was formerly the director the Institute for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence. He was an advisor to former Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Prime Minister Shamir for counter-terrorism, and a senior member of the Israeli delegation to the Madrid Conference of 1992.

You may put your full statement in the record, and we would welcome your summarizing your statement.

STATEMENT OF YIGAL CARMON, PRESIDENT, THE MIDDLE EAST MEDIA RESEARCH INSTITUTION

Mr. CARMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to testify here today.

The media of the Arab world is a tool in the hands of the regimes. In very few countries, opposition papers are permitted, but they too represent a strictly ideological point of view, which is far worse than the regime's, and they have to follow stringent rules of operation, otherwise they might be closed, which indeed happens sometimes.

Recently, a new type of media has emerged in the Arab world, new satellite channels, which are commercial semi-Western in performance and appearance, but cater to the anti-American sentiments of the masses that are already a product of years of government indoctrination.

The Arab media is part of a wider range of indoctrination tools that include educational systems, as well as religious preaching and teaching in mosques. And it is almost impossible to relate to all of what we see there and to cite all of it. We have compiled for your edification a book of some of these. It is interesting but very depressing reading, and yet it is nothing but examples.

The controlled media of the Arab governments convey hatred of the West, and in particular, of the United States. Prior to September 11, one could frequently find articles which openly supported, or even called for, terrorist attacks against the United States. Examples, the Statute of Liberty should be blown up. American vessels should be burnt in the high seas. Support of bin Laden and his activities.

Following September 11, the media overwhelmingly approved of the attacks, and praised Osama bin Laden. It is worth mentioning that articles in the Arab media has said that attacks were the work of the United States Government itself and/or of a Jewish conspiracy.

In view of the tragic sites that we have seen in the first days after September 11, as people suffocated in the wreckage, let me read to you what the Syrian Writers Association Chairman wrote when he saw the pictures on the news channels:

“I felt like someone delivered from the grave. My lungs filled with air, and I breathed in relief as I had never breathed before.”

And then he goes on to say that he finally saw the Arab nation is still alive.

Additionally, to these approaches to the United States, we have seen in the Arab media also personal attacks on American leaders and Administration officials. The examples are many attacks on the President, attacks on the Secretaries of State, are vile and mean. You will see them in the booklet that we have compiled. Attacks on the National Security Advisor, which I would rather not even read to you here.

It is worth mentioning what the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to Britain has written before. He has published his last poem that supports suicide bombing. He wrote a whole article about the President of the United States, and explained that he is a threat to the safety and security of the whole world.

The Arab media has also overwhelmingly objected to the war in Afghanistan and to the continuation of the war against terrorism. The United States is sometimes compared to Nazi Germany, President Bush to Hitler, Guantanamo to Auschwitz, et cetera, even though the Arab media espouses Holocaust denial as well. The way it runs is that Guantanamo is the real Auschwitz if Auschwitz existed.

All three main components of modern Arab anti-Semitism are reflected in the Arab media; namely, (a) western-rooted ancient tracts such as the blood libels and those by the Arab world and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion; (b) ancient Islamic-rooted hatred toward the Jews in the Koran and the Islamic tradition, the Hadith; and (c) the Holocaust denial, alongside, thanks to Hitler, time and again, and the Egyptian government media and the publication of my accounts in various Arab states, and by a PLO-affiliated publication house.

The Arab media reflects yet another self-contradictory phenomenon; despite the fact that most of the Arab regimes are secular, they still enhance the activities of the religious leadership who often promote concepts such as Jihad and martyrdom, with very few exceptions. An example would be the Syrian Bathist secular regime who in textbooks promotes Jihad and martyrdom, explaining the Jihad and martyrdom are actually a transformation into real wider way of life and determined life, of course, with all the benefits as the ultimate profitable deal.

As we have seen, and as we will see in a video that we have prepared for this presentation, the Palestinian Authority provides—gives the opportunity to all those who watch its TV to see its official 5-day sermons preached by official PA employees and what they say you will have a chance to see very soon.

Over the past few years, the Qatari-based Al-Jazeera satellite channel has revolutionized the role of the independent media in the

Arab world. As someone who has appeared on this channel multiple times, I would note that while the overwhelming majority of guests and callers are typically anti-American and anti-Semitic, the station always invites an opposing voice to be heard while the moderator takes one side only and uses his position to further advocate it.

While the overall picture of the Arab media is nothing encouraging, liberal voices of reform do exist. These voices are to be commended for their courage. Many, if not all, are persecuted in their own countries or forced into exile, from where they keep writing in the few, relatively more independent Arabic newspapers in the West, primarily in London. They need the support of the free world in order to bring about change in their countries.

I should mention particularly one strong voice in Kuwait, the Dean of the Sharia, of the Islamic religion faculty in the University of Kuwait, Abd Al-Hamid Al-Ansari, whose opinions you again may see in the booklet we have compiled.

One last note, it is important just to mention on this opportunity the education systems of the Arab world, which are no less powerful a tool of indoctrination of the youth in the Arab world, and they teach and preach, among other messages of hate, Jihad and martyrdom.

I have included for your edification two studies we have published on Syrian and Palestinian Authority textbooks. In the Syrian textbooks, you can find a clear call in so many words to exterminate the Jews. Let me repeat, these are the words, "The Jews should be exterminated" to 10 year old children. And the Palestinian Authority in its new textbooks, the ones that it published, that it worked on, not Egyptian, not Jordanian, but the ones that they have compiled with the help of international experts, with the help of UNESCO—shame on UNESCO—they say to 10 year old children, "The noble soul has two goals—death and the desire for it." Furthermore, they explain origins of races and they give the way, the criteria by which those origins of races should be measured, something that is breathtaking, among other criteria "shape of nose, middle wide to wide, narrow to moderate wide, wide to very wide." The Nazis would have commended them.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Carmon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF YIGAL CARMON, PRESIDENT, THE MIDDLE EAST MEDIA
RESEARCH INSTITUTION

Thank you for the opportunity to testify here today.

The media of the Arab world is a tool in the hands of the regimes. In very few Arab countries, opposition papers are permitted, but they too, represent a strictly ideological point of view and have to follow stringent rules of operation—otherwise they might be closed (which indeed happens sometimes).

Recently, a new type of media has emerged—new satellite channels—which are commercially semi-Western in performance and appearance, but cater to the anti-American sentiments of the masses, which are largely a product of years of government indoctrination. The Arab media is part of a wider range of indoctrination tools that includes educational systems, as well as religious preaching and teaching in mosques. The enclosed booklet on the Arabic media highlights each of these issues.

The controlled media of the Arab governments conveys hatred of the West, and in particular, of the United States. Prior to September 11, one could frequently find articles which openly supported, or even called for, terrorist attacks against the United States. Following September 11, the media overwhelmingly approved of the

attacks, and praised Osama bin Laden. It is worth mentioning that many articles in the Arab media have said that the attacks were the work of the United States government itself and or a Jewish conspiracy. Recent Gallup polls show a large majority of the Arab world continue to believe it.

The Arab media has also overwhelmingly objected to the war in Afghanistan and to the continuation of the U.S. war against terrorism. The United States is sometimes compared to Nazi Germany, President Bush to Hitler, Guantanamo to Aushchwitz, etc., even though the Arab media espouses Holocaust denial as well. All three main components of modern Arab antisemitism are reflected in the Arab media. Namely: A) Western-rooted ancient tracts such as the blood libels, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. B) Ancient Islamic-rooted hatred towards the Jews in the Koran and the Islamic tradition. C) Holocaust denial.

The Arab media reflects yet another self-contradictory phenomenon: despite the fact that most of the Arab regimes are secular and non-democratic, they enhance the activities of the religious leadership who often promote concepts such as Jihad and martyrdom (with very few exceptions). As we have seen with the Palestinian Authority video, this occurs in many forms, such as sermons aired on official government television, religious sections in papers, etc.

Over the past year, the Qatari based Al-Jazeera satellite channel has revolutionized the role of the independent media in the Arab world. As someone who has appeared on this channel multiple times, I would note that while the overwhelming majority of guests and callers are typically anti-American and anti-Semitic; the station always invite an opposing voice to be heard while the moderator takes one side only and uses his position to further advocate it.

While the overall picture of the Arab media is not encouraging, liberal voices of reform exist. These voices are to be commended for their courage. Many, if not all, are persecuted in their own countries or forced into exile, from where they keep writing in the few, relatively more independent, Arabic newspapers in the West. They need the support of the free world in order to bring about social change in their countries.

One last note: it is important to mention the education systems of the Arab world, which are no less a powerful tool of indoctrination of the youth in the Arab world, that teach and preach—among other messages of hate—Jihad and martyrdom. I have included for your edification two studies we have published on Syrian and Palestinian Authority textbooks.*

*NOTE: The studies have been retained in the files of the Committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Carmon. I understand you have a video you would like to show, a short video.

May we proceed with that, please? Could someone dim the lights for us?

[Video presentation.]

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you very much for making that available to us, and we will proceed with questions, and I will start off.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I was told that we could make opening statements before we go to questions.

Mr. GILMAN. Yes. Well, please. You have an opening statement. We will entertain that.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know if our colleagues have opening statements as well.

Mr. GILMAN. Go for it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Go for it. Okay.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding these hearings. I want to commend Mr. Carmon and your organization, MEMRI, for being able to bring us in English what so many in the Arab world and in the Islamic world are seeing. And I know how difficult it sometimes is to even get copies of the newspapers. I have worked with your organization trying to get copies, and I would hope that this Committee would make it clear to our State Department that they ought to be buying the mass circulation publications in the

Arab world, sending them either to the Committee staff or the Library of Congress, making them available for translation.

I know we do not have the resources to translate them all, but scholars in the United States could, because the only thing that concerns me more than what you brought to us is knowing that you have not been able to bring everything that is out there by a long shot.

And all countries have to work to build good human relations. I want to commend ADL for what it does in this country to try to make sure that we all get along.

And it is up to all of us here as Members of Congress, as leaders in our own community to do what I think we all do do, and that is to condemn racism and bigotry whenever it appears in this country or in our local areas. And when racism or bigotry appears in our textbooks, even as a possibility, even in a first draft, we make sure it does not reach the students.

When bigotry or racism were to rear its ugly head in government paid for or government controlled media, we would stop it immediately. And whenever it appears in the private press, it is condemned by all sources of power and authority in this country. And that is why I am so concerned that we do not see the same thing occurring in the Arab world, even among our friends.

I know that several of us have met with President Mubarak of Egypt and brought to his attention the textbooks and the press in Egypt. Any comments that this is free press, and we respect a free press, although in his country it is a press that is to some great extent controlled and very often paid for by the government, but we certainly do not see the response to bigotry in the Egyptian press that I described would occur in the United States. We do not see the official condemnation in the private press, nor do we see the rooting out of bigotry from textbooks in every other government paid for sources.

I believe the witnesses have brought to our attention these ugly attacks against Jews in the media that have occurred since September 11th where the assertion is made that there were no Jewish victims in the World Trade Center; that somehow major disaster occurs in New York and no Jewish-Americans are there; that somehow that this was a Jewish conspiracy.

We know from our personal experience, our work with the victims just how ugly this falsehood is. But the fact that it could be spread in the Islamic world shows that we have got a lot to do as does the recent telethon on Saudi television raising money on the implicit promise that it would be given to the families of suicide bombers.

We in the United States need to demand that Egypt, which receives nearly \$2 billion a year from the United States, react to bigotry in its media the way we would expect the way we do in our country, and would root it out from their textbooks and government paid for publications.

Saudi Arabia owes its continued independence to the United States military. It would have been conquered over a decade ago by Saddam Hussein, and we need to insist there as well. We need to condemn this bigotry when it appears.

And finally, I want to commend my colleagues on this Committee and in particular my colleague from the San Fernando Valley, Mr. Berman, for his advocacy of the one antidote to this poison. We need not only to leach out the poison, but we need to apply the antidote disinfectant of truth, and one of the most effective ways to do that is with a radio broadcasting system on AM and FM that will appear to listeners, not just to those who have short wave, but in every automobile in the Arab and Islamic world so that those who care can hear the truth.

I yield back.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sherman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Engel.

Mr. ENGEL. Yes. I am wondering if I could make a statement as well.

Mr. GILMAN. Yes, if you will be brief—

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. GILMAN [continuing]. So that we can get into questioning.

Mr. ENGEL. I want to thank the three witnesses. I listened to them intently, and they are really performing a very, very important service.

I just wanted to read into the record some statements that were made and Mr. Carmon's video perhaps did it better than I can do it. But I really just want to do this because I think it is really important at a time when we are talking about negotiations with Yasser Arafat, whom I believe is an unrepentant terrorist, and will never be anything else. I, frankly, think it is fruitless to have negotiations with him. He proved that 18 or 19 months ago.

But if you just look into what he said just recently, December 18, 2001,

“Every baby, every kid, every man, every woman and every old person, and all the young people, we will all sacrifice ourselves for our holy places.”

Just this January, again on Palestinian television, “Jihad, Jihad, Jihad, Jihad.” This is again Yasser Arafat whom we should ostensibly negotiate with, when the Secretary of State went hat-in-hand to him, recently said,

“We are all seekers of martyrdom. The entire Palestinian people is a seeker of martyrdom.”

We all know what martyrdom means. It means suicide or homicide bombings.

His wife, Suha Arafat, just recently, April 15, Monday,

“Suicide bomber, no greater honor.”

It is a quote from her.

Faysal Al-Husseini, the Palestinian minister for Jerusalem affairs, June 24 of last year,

“The Oslo accords were a Trojan horse. The strategic goal is liberation of Palestine from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea,”

meaning no more Israel.

The Mufti of Jerusalem, again,

“The younger the martyr, the greater and more I respect him.”
 Interesting how these old men send the young kids out to blow themselves up.

Member of the Palestinian Authority FACA Council, Ahmad Abu Halabiya,

“Have no mercy on the Jews no matter where they are, in any country, fight them, kill them, kill those Jews and those Americans who are like them.”

Hosni Mubarak, our great ally in Egypt, Mr. Sherman talked about Egyptian radio and TV, this is December 7, 2001, our great ally, Hosni Mubarak who refused to meet with Secretary Powell the other day,

“People like Omar Abd al-Reihman and bin Laden were American heroes,”

December 7, 2001, this is what he say. Al-Akhbar, you said this Mr. Sherman, the *Egyptian Government Daily* columnist Ahamad Ragub, April 18, 2001,

“Thanks to Hitler, a blessed memory, who on behalf of the Palestinians revenged in advance against the most vile criminals on the face of the earth.”

Again the *Egyptian Government Weekly*, Al-Ahram, columnist Galal Nasfar,

“The U.S., Israel and Turkey are the true acts of evil.”

Okay, Sheik Mohammed el-Gamei’a, Al-Azhar University representative in the U.S., and Imam of the Islamic Cultural Center in New York City where I am from,

“This war will be the end of America. If the American knew that the Jews carried out the September 11th attacks, they would do to the Jews what Hitler did.”

Just have a few more, and then I will stop. We know Gadaffi, what he is saying, again publicized in the Arab media,

“Foreign nurses injected children in the City of Bengazi the AIDS virus while pretending to immunize them. The CIA or the Israeli Mossad were behind this crime.”

And Bashar Assad, again who Secretary Powell ran to Damascus to meet, May 5, 2001, who occupied Lebanon, May 5, 2001, he said,

“They, the Jews, tried to kill the principles of all religion with the same mentality in which they betrayed Jesus Christ and the same way they tried to betray and kill the Prophet Mohammed.”

The Syrian Defense Minister, Mustafa Talas says, and again this is May 2001, speech during the Pope’s visit to Syria,

“I want to stand in one place and kill the Jew standing before me. If every Arab kills a Jew, there won’t be any Jews left at all.”

I think that we are obviously dealing with a very, very serious problem, and quite frankly, our so-called Arab allies in the Middle

East need to really understand that they are becoming part of the problem, not part of the solution, and the billions of dollars of foreign aid that go to Egypt and some of the other countries who actively promote anti-American, anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli propaganda, we really need to call them to a higher standard and tell them that it will not be tolerated any longer.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Engel.

Ms. Berkley.

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate being here and I will try to be brief.

I did not plan to make a statement. I just came to listen. But I just cannot sit here and let this moment pass without saying a few words.

When I was a kid, I was involved in all the Jewish youth groups. I grew up in Las Vegas, and there was a small Jewish community, and we all participated. As part of what I saw, we saw films of the liberation of the Holocaust, and I would sit there and see these films and think to myself, as an 11-, 12-, 13-year-old girl, how could this happen? This must be some sort of aberration. Human beings do not deal with each other in this manner. Something must have happened to have precipitated this, to have triggered this horror.

And I resolved at that time at a very young age to be a part of the solution, and to stand up for what I believed to become a public servant so that I could ensure that nothing like that could ever happen again.

And here I am many years later, after having been a participant in my community, as a citizen activist being involved with ADL, being involved with World of Difference and every other program imaginable, to bridge the gap between various peoples and come to an understanding about all of our uniqueness and differences, and see if we could not enhance humanity by working together.

And here I am in Congress at a time that I am experiencing and seeing the worst type of anti-Semitism in my lifetime and ever imaginable.

I think it is time that we as Americans have enough pride and dignity in ourselves and our fellow Americans and the millions of Jews that live here to stand up and proclaim that this is unacceptable.

I agree with the past speakers. When we talk about these so-called moderate Arab countries, these so-called moderate or Arab allies of ours, if these are our allies, I would hate to see what our enemies are like. This is the worst kind of filth. This is the worst kind of demagoguery. This is the worst kind of anti-Semitism. If we do not stand up as a Nation, if we do not stand with Daniel Pearl and say that everybody throughout the world, everybody in America was a Jew on the day that this man proclaimed that he was Jewish and he was the son of a mother who was Jewish, where are we as a Nation? Where is our morality and our decency and our sense of ethics about what we will not tolerate as a Nation?

And we should not be sending our Vice President over to cool his heels and talk to these potentates that have no better right to be heads of their nations than the man on the moon, and we should not send our best Secretary of States and expect—and allow that

to go on. And we should not be inviting a Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia to Crawford, Texas to be wined and dined by the President of the United States.

We have a responsibility to stand up and tell the world who we are, what we are as Americans, and that this cannot go on. If not, shame on us because we are just as guilty as the people that are perpetrating this filth and disgrace to the rest of the world and to humanity.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Ms. Berkley.

We will confine ourselves to one question each because of our time constraints in the votes that are on the Floor. I am going to ask our panelists, do you agree with Mr. Foxman's proposal for U.S., Israeli, Palestinian Anti-Incitement Committee.

Mr. Indyk, if we can be brief because we are being called to the Floor?

Mr. INDYK. Well, I think it is a useful device. We have some experience with it, but it was not a good experience. So I think that in the context of agreements that are struck, it is very important to make sure that various mechanisms are instituted to deal with the problem of incitement.

But we are so far from agreements now that I think that we need to focus elsewhere.

I notice that Mr. Foxman also called for a presidential commission to highlight this problem and provide policy recommendations. I do think that is a good idea. But I would come back to what I suggested, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me for pushing my own idea, but I do think that the Congress needs to set up a watchdog operation.

Mr. GILMAN. Some vehicle.

Mr. INDYK. Some vehicle here in the Congress—

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you.

Mr. INDYK [continuing]. To report on this.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Carmon, what are your thoughts?

Mr. CARMON. Anything that would enhance—any Committee, I mean, that would enhance the knowledge of what is being said, and any organ of research would be absolutely needed.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you. Mr. Berman, one question, brief please.

Mr. BERMAN. I apologize for missing the testimony. My question, I guess, is perhaps more to Ambassador Indyk than the other distinguished panelists simply because he may have had experience here.

But I am curious how the "Palestinian moderates," the people that come to Washington that we meet with, the Sari Nusseibehs, and the people who frequently speak at least with us and sometimes more openly about reconciliation and peace, how do they react, what do they say when confronted with the kind of horrible garbage that I saw as I came in today, as I heard some of my colleagues make reference to in terms of the incitement and the kind of speech? How do they deal with this issue?

Mr. INDYK. Well, it varies. Some of them are very decent people, very moderate in their own views, but they simply do not have the ability in the way that the Palestinian Authority is structured to influence that. It is really Yasser Arafat himself who sets the tone, as I tried suggest in my testimony.

Mr. BERMAN. Color for who?

Mr. INDYK. For all of them. It's President Mubarak, it's Crown Prince Abdullah, it starts at the top. If they set the tone, if they open up the space, reasonable people, moderate people, people who understand the damage that this does to the process of reconciliation can speak up. But if they do not have the approval from above or the space created from above, they will not do anything about it except say in private how bad it is. They will admit that it is bad.

But the experience of the Anti-Incitement Committee, for example, was one in which, because there were other parts of the agreement that were not being implemented for one reason or another, Arafat made it clear to his people that nothing should happen in the Anti-Incitement Committee, and of course nothing did.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Sherman.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Carmon, is there any positive material that you could point to from the Palestinian Authority, particular in its textbooks, where they are educating their next generation for peace and for an acceptance of Israel as a state?

Mr. CARMON. In the textbooks, unfortunately not. The textbooks do not even recognize the existence of Israel as far as maps are concerned. The Oslo Agreements is mentioned just in a very marginal way in half a sentence that deals with something else, with the entry of the Palestinian troops into Palestine.

But out of these textbooks—by the way, the study that we have prepared on the Palestinian textbook does not focus at all on the conflict with Israel, but rather with other elements, an example of which I gave. There is an education to general hate toward anything foreign, even foreign way of dressing. But there are moderates, Sabein Asaby is a case in point. He is a very unique person who does say the same thing in English and in Arabic, and there are others who write in papers. There are voices, liberal voices that we hear, and they are part of our booklet.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Foxman.

Mr. FOXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to second and endorse Ambassador Indyk's recommendation that through the research facilities of the U.S. Congress that we do monitor, and with all due respect to MEMRI and Mr. Carmon, and efforts of other organizations, including ours, it will give it a greater sense of importance, significance, credibility when MEMRI reports reflect the same type of findings of hatred and incitement against Jews, Americans, that comes out of research facilities of the American government.

I think it is very important because one of the other problems we have is what other nations are feeling about it, how seriously they are taking it. And a decision that the U.S. government will monitor incitement and hate directed at not only against America, but against allies, Jews, Israel, will deal with anti-Semitism, and maybe even request a report to the United Nations to get peoples' attention to how serious the problem is.

And Mr. Chairman, one comment. Congressman Sherman is here. I have stopped arguing with President Mubarak who did not want to see me last time, whether Egypt has or does not have free press. At this point I said I do not care. But Mr. President, let us assume there is a free press. Then you speak out. You say this is unacceptable in Egypt. It is unacceptable in Islam.

Mr. GILMAN. And we have said that to President Mubarak on a number of occasions.

I regret that we have 3 minutes left to get to the Floor. I want to thank our panelists for being here today, for your astute testimony, and I will have to declare the hearing adjourned since we have a number of votes on the Floor.

Mr. FOXMAN. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DARRELL E. ISSA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for putting together this hearing. I feel compelled to speak on this issue because I have personally been a victim of anti-Americanism and irresponsibility in the Arab press. In November of last year, several Arab news agencies completely misreported my comments at a press conference. While I called for the governments of Syria and Lebanon to rein in the terrorist organization, Hezbollah, these press agencies claimed that I had said Hezbollah was legitimate. These reports were patently untrue, completely made up—they were lies, and they were intended to confuse and distort the message that I brought to the governments of Lebanon and Syria. It was a relatively mild example compared to the the malicious and increasingly irresponsible nature of some Arab news organizations. As we will hear today, there are many more examples of extreme irresponsibility in Arab press.

But Mr. Chairman, irresponsibility and incitement in the media is not unique to the Arab world. Sadly, it exists in the European press, it exists in the Israeli press, and it exists in our own American press. Just as I have been a victim of anti-Americanism in the Arab world, I have also been a victim of racially motivated anti-Arab sentiments in the American media. One columnist in particular has attempted to question my patriotism, using a combination of outright lies and horrible distortions of statements that I have made in this Committee. Yet, like my experience with the Arab media, these attacks are mild in comparison to other irresponsible, and ill-informed reporting that has unfairly stigmatized the Arab world and the Arab-American community.

Mr. Chairman, irresponsibility in the media is a problem—a serious problem. But let's not kid ourselves by trying to argue that it is a problem in the Arab world alone. Irresponsible press in Israel, the United States, and the Arab world is a symptom of a much greater problem—that is a fundamental lack of trust between the West and the Arab world, and vice versa. Until we begin to bridge the gap that only appears to be widening between the United States, Israel and the Arab world, no amount of Congressional hearings will stop the steady flow of words that is widening the divide between us.

REPORT OF THE HONORABLE ELIOT L. ENGEL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM
THE STATE OF NEW YORK

APRIL 18, 2002

The Power of Words

Excerpts of Incitement in the Arab World

THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

Yasser Arafat—December 18, 2001

“Every baby, every kid, every man, every woman and every old person and all the young people, we will all sacrifice ourselves for our holy places.”

Yasser Arafat—January 26, 2002

“Jihad, jihad, jihad, jihad!” (*Palestinian Television*)

Yasser Arafat—March 29, 2002

“We are all seekers of martyrdom. The entire Palestinian people is a seeker of martyrdom. (*Al-Jazeera*)

Suha Arafat

Suicide Bomber: “No greater honor.” (*The New York Times*, April 15, 2002)

Farouq Al-Qadumi, PLO’s Political Department Head—December 12, 2001

“In this war, one incites the public for 20 hours, and fights for perhaps two hours.” (*Al-Hayat* [London])

Faysal Al-Husseini, Palestinian Minister for Jerusalem Affairs—June 24, 2001

“The Oslo Accords were a Trojan Horse; the strategic goal is the liberation of Palestine from the [Jordan] River to the [Mediterranean] Sea.” (*Al-Arabi* [Egypt])

Yasser Abd Rabou, Palestinian Authority Minister of Information—July 28, 2001

“The struggle cannot be separated from the negotiations.” (*Al-Sharq Al-Awsat*)

Hassan Al-Kashef, Palestinian Information Ministry, Director-General—February 20, 2002

“Today’s most effective negotiator is the fighter active in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and Jerusalem. It is he who consciously and courageously gets soldiers and settlers.” (*Al-Hayat Al-Jadida*)

Mufti Sheik Ikrimi Sabri, The Mufti of Jerusalem—October 28, 2000

“The younger the martyr—the greater and the more I respect him.” (*Al-Ahram Al-Arabi* [Egypt])

Ahmad Abu Halabiya, Member of P.A. “Fatwa Council”, Friday sermon—October 2000

“Have no mercy on the Jews, no matter where they are, in any country. Fight them . . . kill them . . . kill those Jews and those Americans who are like them.” (Palestinian TV)

EGYPT

Hosni Mubarak—December 7, 2001

“People like Omar Abd Al-Rahman and bin Laden were American heroes.” (Pro-Syrian Lebanese daily *Al-Safir*)

Ahmad Ragab, Columnist—April 18, 2001

“Thanks to Hitler, of blessed memory, who on behalf of the Palestinians, revenged in advance, against the most vile criminals on the face of the earth” (*Al-Akhbar*, Egyptian government daily)

Galal Nassar, Columnist—March 7–13, 2002

“The U.S., Israel, and Turkey ‘The True Axis of Evil’” (Egyptian government weekly)

Sheikh Muhammad Al-Gamei’a, Al-Azhar University representative in the U.S. and Imam of the Islamic Cultural Center of New York City—October 4, 2001

“This war will be the end of America . . . If the Americans knew that the Jews carried out the September 11 attacks they would do to the Jews what Hitler did! . . .”

Sheikh Ali Abu Al-Hassan, Head of Al-Azhar University (Egypt) Religious Ruling Committee—October 15, 2001

“What America is doing now is world terror waged against the weak . . . the forces of tyranny deserve to be defeated.”

SAUDI ARABIA

Ghazi Algoasibi, Saudi Ambassador to Britain—April 13, 2002

“She embraced death with a smile while the leaders are running away from death.” (Saudi-owned Arabic daily *Al Hayat*)

Ghazi Algoasibi, Saudi Ambassador to Britain—April 13, 2002

“We complained to the idols of a White House whose heart is filled with darkness.” (Saudi-owned Arabic daily *Al Hayat*)

LIBYA

Mu'ammār Al-Qadhafī—April 29, 2001

“Foreign nurses injected . . . children in the city of Benghazi . . . AIDS virus, while pretending to immunize them . . . CIA or the Israeli Mossad were behind this crime.” (*Al-Ahram* (Egypt))

SYRIA

Bashar Assad—May 5, 2001

“They [Jews] tried to kill the principles of all religions with the same mentality in which they betrayed Jesus Christ and the same way they tried to betray and kill the Prophet Mohammed.”

Mustafa Talas, Syrian Defense Minister—May 2001

“I want to stand in one place and kill the Jew standing before me. If every Arab kills a Jew, there won't be any Jews left at all.”

AL-QAEDA

Usamah bin Ladin—February 22, 1998

“The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies—civilians and military—is an individual duty for every Muslim”

Usamah bin Ladin—August 23, 1998

“We declared jihad against the U.S. government . . . so that we drive the Americans away from all Muslim countries”

Usamah bin Ladin

“You will leave [Saudi Arabia] when the youth send you in wooden boxes and coffins. And you will carry in them the bodies of American troops and civilians. This is when you will leave.” (*Esquire Magazine*, 1999)

Usamah bin Ladin

“Our enemy, the target if God gives Muslims the opportunity to do so is every American male” (*Esquire Magazine*, 1999)

Usamah Bin-Ladin

“We are sure of our victory against the Americans and the Jews . . . Judgment day shall not come until the Muslim fights the Jew, where the Jew will hide behind trees and stones, and the tree and the stone will speak and say, ‘Muslim, behind me is a Jew. Come and kill him.’” (*Esquire Magazine*, 1999)

